

Tom Buchele, OSB # 081560  
Earthrise Law Center  
10015 SW Terwilliger Blvd.  
Portland, Oregon 97219  
Tel: (503) 768-6736  
Fax: (503) 768-6642  
Email: tbuchele@lclark.edu

Attorney for Plaintiff League of Wilderness Defenders/Blue Mountains  
Biodiversity Project

Jennifer Schemm, OSB # 970086  
Attorney at Law  
602 O Ave.  
La Grande, Oregon 97850  
Tel: 541-962-0896  
Fax: (541) 962-7831  
Email: jschemm@eoni.com

Attorney for Plaintiff Hells Canyon Preservation Council

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION**

**LEAGUE OF WILDERNESS  
DEFENDERS/BLUE MOUNTAINS  
BIODIVERSITY PROJECT, *et al.*,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**KENT P. CONNAUGHTON, *et al.*,**

Defendants,

and

**BAKER COUNTY**, a political subdivision  
of the State of Oregon, *et al.*,

Defendant-Intervenors.

Case No. 3:12-cv-02271-HZ

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION  
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Oral Argument Requested

Date: October 10, 2014  
Time: 1:30 p.m.  
Courtroom: 14B  
Judge: Hon. Marco A. Hernández

Pursuant to Local Rule 7-1(a), the parties made a good faith effort to resolve their dispute, but were unable to do so. The parties did agree upon which claims plaintiffs would seek summary judgment, with one misunderstanding. When plaintiffs stated in the stipulated motion for revised briefing schedule (Dkt No. 88), that they “will not pursue the claims the appellate court found were not likely to succeed on the merits, except for the NEPA bull trout claim,” plaintiffs implied they intended to pursue the one claim the appellate court held was likely to succeed: Claim 1, Count 4 (failure to complete a SEIS after the travel management plan (TMP) was withdrawn). Defendants, however, understood plaintiffs intended to pursue only the bull trout claim, not the TMP claim. The parties discussed this matter after plaintiffs noticed defendants did not address the TMP claim in their summary judgment motion. The parties agreed defendants will argue their position on this claim in their response to plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment.

Now, upon further consideration of the Ninth Circuit’s decision, 2014 WL 1814172 (9th Cir. 2014), plaintiffs will not pursue the NEPA bull trout claim (Claim 1 count 12) or Claim 1 count 2 (failure to complete a SEIS in light of newly proposed 130 acre regeneration sale). Plaintiffs believe the appellate court’s decision, effectively decided these issues in defendants’ favor.

Plaintiffs therefore move this Court for an order granting summary judgment in favor of plaintiffs on Claim 1, Counts 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11, and Claim 2 of the Amended Complaint. This motion is supported by the supporting memorandum, the administrative record (AR) lodged by defendants, the Fourth Declaration of Jennifer Schemm, and the Declaration of Brian Kelly, filed herewith.

Respectfully submitted this 14th day of July, 2014.

2 – PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Jennifer Williams 7/13/14 6:08 PM

Deleted: -

s/ Tom Buchele  
Tom Buchele (OSB # 081560)  
Email: [tbuchele@lclark.edu](mailto:tbuchele@lclark.edu)

Attorney for Plaintiff League of Wilderness  
Defenders/Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project

s/ Jennifer Schemm  
Jennifer Schemm (OSB # 970086)  
Email: [jschemm@eoni.com](mailto:jschemm@eoni.com)

Attorney for Plaintiff Hells Canyon Preservation  
Council